



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/829,624	04/22/2004	Eric L. Barsness	ROC920030407US1	7304
46797 7590 12/19/2007 IBM CORPORATION, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPT 917, BLDG. 006-1 3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829			EXAMINER COLAN, GIOVANNA B	
			ART UNIT 2162	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/19/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/829,624

Applicant(s)

BARSNESS ET AL.

Examiner

Giovanna Colan

Art Unit

2162

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 19 November 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: 1. The arguments regarding the "Specification Objections" have been considered. The objection to the specification has been withdrawn.

2. Applicant argues that the applied art fails to disclose; "determining correlation attributes for a first column and a second column from one or more database tables".

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The combination of Sandler in view or Kaufman does disclose: determining correlation attributes for a first column and a second column from one or more database tables (Fig. 18A, items 1806, and 1804, Page 17, [0235], lines 7 - 12; "...all of the values in field K1 1804 that have the same values in field F1 1806..."; wherein the step of mapping which includes all of the values in field K1 1804 that have the same values in field F1 1806 corresponds to the step of determining the correlation attributes as claimed; wherein values F1 corresponds to the first column claimed; and wherein values in K1 corresponds to the second column claimed; Sandler). Also, Examiner interprets that since the prior art teaches values of first column that have the same vales in second column then a correlation of such columns is determined.

3. Applicant argues that the applied art fails to disclose; "determining a correlation value indicating a degree of correlation between the first and the second column and determining whether the correlation value exceeds a predetermined threshold".

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The combination of Sandler in view or Kaufman does disclose: determining a correlation value indicating a degree of correlation between the first and the second column and determining whether the correlation value exceeds a predetermined threshold (Page 2 and 4, [0018] and [0059]; respectively, Sandler).

4. With respect to claim 6, 9, and 11, applicant argues that; "In rejecting these claims the Examiner cites portions of Sandler unrelated to the 'aggregation operation' cited in the rejection of the underlying independent claim" and further that; "the isolated fragments cited by the Examiner fail to disclose the claimed characterizations of the 'correlation attributes'."

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The paragraphs cited by the Examiner are related to the correlation attributes claimed in the independent claim. For example, the applied art does discloses: wherein the correlation attributes are determined on the basis of the determined metadata (Claim 6) (Page 18, [0251], lines 3 - 10, Sandler; also see - Page 18, [0245], "edits to source tables that result from transactions may be propagated through table rules...as well as through an aggregation operation...", [0251], "...system identifies all the tables that will be affected by the edits...To identify these tables, the system consults the mappings that are stored in the metadata...", Sandler); wherein the correlation attributes are determined on the basis of the determined statistical parameter (Claim 9) (Page 4, [0059], "... this information can be used to increase the efficiency of certain operations, such as, table joins,...", Sandler); and wherein the correlation attributes are determined on the basis of the determined ontological properties (Claim 11) (Page 8, [0110], lines 3 - 9, Sandler).

5. Applicant argues that; "the process of 'combining the same values in fields' in no way discloses the step of 'determining the degree of correlation'...".

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The applied art does disclose determining a degree of correlation between the at least two columns... (Page 17 and 18, [0235] and [0251], lines 8 - 15 and 3 - 10; respectively, wherein the step of mapping by combining the same values in fields corresponds to the step of determining the degree of correlation as claimed; wherein the "many-to-one" corresponds to the metadata claimed; wherein the values in the fields corresponds to the analyzed content claimed; and wherein the mapping after combining the values, for example: value of the field F 1802, corresponds to the degree of correlation claimed; Sandler)..



PIERRE VITAL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100